

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office action dated July 26, 2006, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wallach et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,905, hereinafter "Wallach").

With this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 15, and 17.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

As amended, Claim 1 requires "a workstation adapted to couple to the file servers and to a client computer." Claim 1 also requires "the workstation is adapted to cause at least some software or data that is not permanently stored on the workstation to be transferred to the workstation from the file system via at least one of the file servers when requested by the client computer;" and "the client computer is adapted to utilize the at least some software or data transferred to the workstation." Wallach, while disclosing redundant servers and remapping to a secondary server in the event that the primary server fails, does not disclose that the workstation is adapted to couple to a client computer, as claimed. The Examiner asserts that the second server 54 of Wallach is readable as a workstation, however, the disclosure of Wallach makes clear that the second server 54 of Wallach is required as backup to the primary server 56, meaning that the second server 54 must function as a file server rather than a workstation. If the second server 54 functioned as a workstation, the system of Wallach would be rendered non-functional in the event that the primary server 56 failed, thereby defeating the intended purpose of Wallach. For this reason, Wallach lacks the claimed client computer.

Wallach also does not disclose that the software or data not permanently stored on the workstation is transferred to the workstation from the file system via at least one of the plurality of file servers when requested by the client computer, because Wallach lacks the claimed client computer, and therefore a request for transfer of software or data to the workstation cannot be made. Still further, Wallach does not disclose a client computer adapted to utilize the software or data transferred to the workstation. No other reference satisfies these

deficiencies. For at least these reasons, Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are believed to be in condition for allowance.

As amended, Claim 7 requires "a workstation adapted to couple to the file servers and to a client computer." Claim 7 also requires that "the workstation comprises a storage medium on which control files are permanently stored, but client applications are not permanently stored." Furthermore, claim 7 requires that "the workstation is adapted to cause client applications and data to be transferred to the workstation from the file system via at least one of the file servers when requested by the client computer." Additionally claim 7 requires that "the client computer is adapted to utilize the at least some software or data transferred to the workstation." As discussed above, Wallach lacks the claimed workstation coupled to the file servers and to a client computer, as the server 54 of Wallach is required, by virtue of the invention disclosed and claimed by Wallach, to function as a server, and not a client computer or workstation.

Wallach also does not disclose that the workstation stores control files permanently, but not client applications. The Examiner asserts that client applications are not stored on the server but are stored on the client. Respectfully, this assertion does not make sense, given that what is claimed is that the applications are, upon request from a client computer, transferred from the file system via a file server to the workstation.

Still further, Wallach does not disclose that the workstation is adapted to cause client applications as well as data to be transferred to the workstation from the file system via at least one of the file servers when requested by the client computer. Finally, Wallach does not disclose that the client computer is adapted to utilize the software or data transferred to the workstation. No other reference satisfies these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, Claim 7 and the claims depending therefrom are believed to be in condition for allowance.

As amended, Claim 15 requires "means for executing the client applications as required by a client computer." The instant application discloses at least a workstation, as the means for executing the client applications as required by a client computer, as well as the means for retrieving the client

applications and data from the means for storing the client applications and data (*i.e.*, the file system) (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0013-0014], [0020-0021]). Wallach lacks any means for executing client applications as required by a client computer, for the same reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. No other reference satisfies this deficiency of Wallach. No other reference satisfies these deficiencies. For at least this reason, Claim 15 and the claims depending therefrom are believed to be in condition for allowance.

As amended, Claim 17 requires that the "CPU requests a client application and data from an external file system via a file server on behalf of a client and executes the client application on behalf of the client." Wallach, while disclosing redundant servers and remapping to a secondary server in the event that the primary server fails, does not disclose that the CPU of a workstation request a client application and data from an external file system via a file server on behalf of a client and executes the client application on behalf of the client.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the secondary server 54 of Wallach is required, by virtue of the invention disclosed, to function as a file server that backs up the primary server, and thus cannot be read as the claimed workstation. Additionally, even reading the secondary server 54 of Wallach as a workstation, the secondary server 54 of Wallach is not disclosed as requesting client applications and/or data from an external file system upon request of the client and executing the application on behalf of the client. No other reference satisfies these deficiencies. For at least this reason, Claim 17 and the claims depending therefrom are believed to be in condition for allowance.

II. CONCLUSION


In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may

Appl. No. 10/672,955
Amdt. dated October 11, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 26, 2006

be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonna T. Flores
PTO Reg. No. 56,803
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400